



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/682,519	09/13/2001	Yu Wang	040489-0177	2614

22428 7590 12/01/2006

FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP
SUITE 500
3000 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

ROJAS, BERNARD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2832

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/682,519

Applicant(s)

WANG, YU

Examiner

Bernard Rojas

Art Unit

2832

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09/19/2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22, 39 and 40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22, 39 and 40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, filed 9/19/2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-22, 39 and 40 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Hsieh [US 5,016,638].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 7-11, 14, 19-21 and 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsieh [US 5,016,638] in view of van Oort [US 5,923,235].

Claim 1, Hsieh discloses a medical imaging device [10] located on a vibration isolation system [74] mounted in the structure [72] of a building [col. 7 lines 20-25].

Hsieh fails to teach the use of an open clam-shell MRI magnet system.

van Oort discloses an open style, clam-shell MRI magnet system [figure 1].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the MRI as taught by van Oort since Whittaker et al. discloses that the vibration isolation system is used to isolate a structure from the vibrations of an MRI [abs].

Claims 7 and 19, Hsieh, as modified, discloses an MRI system, wherein the vibration isolation system is secured to a floor [72] and the MRI magnet system is attached over the vibration isolation system [figure 2].

Claims 8 and 20, Hsieh, as modified, discloses an MRI system, wherein the vibration isolation system is configured within a footprint of the MRI magnet system [figure 1].

Claim 9, Hsieh, as modified, discloses the MRI system of claim 1, further comprising a structural holder [18] positioned between the vibration isolation system and the MRI magnet system [figures 2, 3 and 5].

Claims 10 and 21, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the vibration isolation system as shown by Hsieh for a preexisting MRI magnet system by merely installing the isolation system into the floor and place the MRI onto the system.

Claim 11, Hsieh, as modified, discloses the MRI system of claim 10, wherein the vibration isolation system is mounted on posts [74] such that MRI magnet system supports do not contact a floor of a site where the MRI magnet system is located [figures 2 and 3].

Claim 14, van Oort discloses an open magnet assembly with a floor mount comprising:

- a first assembly mounted about a first longitudinally-extending and generally-vertically-aligned axis including:
- at least one superconducting main coil (26) positioned around the axis; and

Art Unit: 2832

- a vacuum enclosure (24) enclosing the at least one superconductive main coil;
- a second assembly mounted about a second longitudinally-extending and generally-vertically-aligned axis coaxially aligned with the first axis and spaced longitudinally apart from and disposed below the first assembly, the second assembly including:

- at least one superconducting main coil (30) positioned around the axis; and
- a vacuum enclosure (28) enclosing the at least one superconductive main coil;

and

- at least one support beam (32) external to the first and second vacuum enclosures having a first end attached to the first assembly and a second end attached to the second assembly.

Claim 39, van Oort discloses the open MRI system of claim 1, wherein the open clam-shell MRI magnet system comprises a vertically aligned MRI magnet system [figure 1].

Claim 40, van Oort discloses the open MRI system of claim 39, wherein the vertically- aligned, open clam-shell MRI magnet system comprises: a first magnet assembly containing a first superconductive coil [24]; a second magnet assembly containing a second superconductive coil [30]; and only two support members [32] supporting the second magnet assembly over the first magnet assembly, wherein the two support members are not diametrically aligned to a diameter line of the first and the second magnet assemblies [figure 1].

Claims 2-4, 12-13, 15-17 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsieh [US 5,016,638] in view of van Oort [US 5,923,235], as applied to claims 1, 7-11, 14, 19-21 and 39-40 above, and further in view of Ohsaki [US 6,202,492].

Hsieh in view of van Oort discloses the instant claimed invention except for the isolators being adjustable and actively pneumatically controlled.

Ohsaki discloses a surface [6] being supported by adjustable actively controlled pneumatic isolators [4a-d, column 5, lines 1-12].

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to the isolator design of Ohsaki for the isolators of Whittaker et al. in view of van Oort for the purpose of accommodating variations in the operating environment.

The specific frequencies, Q-factors, bandwidth, etc. of the control would have been obvious design considerations based on the specific application and environment of use.

Claims 5-6 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsieh [US 5,016,638] in view of van Oort [US 5,923,235], as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of Braun [US 4,781,363].

Whittaker et al. in view of van Oort discloses the instant claimed invention except for the use of balance weights on the isolators.

Braun discloses the use of balance weights [9] mounted on an isolator.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use balance weights on the isolators of Whittaker et al. in view of van Oort, for the purpose of accommodating unexpected balance shifts.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bernard Rojas whose telephone number is (571) 272-1998. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:00), every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Elvin G. Enad can be reached on (571) 272-1990. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Br


ELVIN ENAD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
2720006